



## **Department of Children and Family Services Contracts Administration Division**



### **SCSF RFP Selection Process and Funding Methodology**

#### **BACKGROUND ON SOLICITATION PROCESS**

---

The Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) has used the informed averaging evaluation methodology, in accordance with Board Policy 5.054 (Evaluation Methodology for Proposals, dated 06/01/09).

This process establishes Informed Averaging as the best practice method for scoring and evaluating competitive solicitations such as this Requests for Proposal (RFP). The evaluators were carefully screened to ensure there was no conflict of interest with the proposals that they were reviewing for each agency. Each proposal submitted was reviewed by a panel of 3-4 evaluators. DCFS worked closely with the Internal Services Department to identify evaluators from other County Departments. The RFP was released on January 3, 2013 and proposals were due on April 8, 2013. The following services were placed on bid: Adoption Promotion Support Services; Child Abuse Neglect Prevention Intervention Treatment Services; Family Preservation; Partnerships for Families Services; and Prevention & After Care Services.

DCFS received over 300 proposals in response to the RFP. Each proposal was evaluated and scored by a three to four member panel – with each evaluator conducting an independent evaluation. The evaluators consisted of staff from DCFS and other County departments. Each evaluator was screened for conflicts. Proposals were evaluated and scored by a panel based on four areas: Qualifications (which include background/experience), weighted 30%; Approach, weighted 40%; Quality Assurance Plan, weighted 10%; and Cost, weighted 20%. Evaluators scored each proposal and the informed averaging methodology was used to calculate a composite score, as required by County policy. Individual proposals were ranked based on the proposal's composite score. For each contract type, DCFS recommended that contracts be awarded based on the highest scoring proposals, limited by both the allocated funding and the projected need of the Service Planning Area or DCFS regional office.

There was a public comment period from November 5, 2012 through November 15, 2012. We also held a public comment conference on November 8, 2012 along with a Bidders' conference on February 5, 2013. A total of 106 comments were received from agencies in the community who were interested in bidding for this solicitation.



## **Department of Children and Family Services**

### **Contracts Administration Division**



#### **FUNDING METHODOLOGY**

---

Prior to the release of the solicitation for the Safe Children Strong Families contracts, DCFS developed a methodology for the allocation of funding. The amount of funding per DCFS Regional Office was allocated based on the percentage of aggregated DCFS cases that offices held between 2006-2011. CWS/CMS data from DATAMART was obtained from DCFS' GIS section and provided to USC GIS Researcher, Professor Dan Goldberg, who identified the proportion of cases assigned to each office. For example, if a DCFS regional office had 7.64% of the total DCFS cases between 2006 and 2011, the Family Preservation (FP) allocation for the office would be 7.64% of the total available FP funding. This new "needs-based allocation" accounts for any large variance from past years' funding, to current proposed funding, and was clearly reflected in the published RFP document titled: "NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED and FUNDING ALLOCATIONS PER SPA or REGIONAL OFFICE."

You will note that in this current solicitation the projected number of Family Preservation contracts per DCFS office has been reduced. This was done in an effort to ensure that each contract award provides for adequate capital to run a financially viable program.

County of Los Angeles – Department of Children and Family Services  
Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services – RFP # 11-053A  
**NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED and FUNDING ALLOCATIONS PER SPA or REGIONAL OFFICE**

FUNDING PER PROGRAM	CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION TREATMENT	FAMILY PRESERVATION	PREVENTION and AFTERCARE	ADOPTION PROMOTION and SUPPORT	PARTNERSHIPS for FAMILIES
	EXHIBIT B	EXHIBIT C	EXHIBIT A	EXHIBIT D	EXHIBIT E
	\$2,862,000	\$29,706,740	\$6,618,348	\$2,984,000	TBD

DCFS REGIONAL OFFICE	Projected Number of CAPIT contracts	CAPIT Allocation by Regional Office	Projected Number of Contracts for Family Preservation	FP Funding Allocations per Regional Office	SPAs	Projected Contract Allocations for Prevention and Aftercare Services <sup>3</sup>	Projected # of Contracts for APSS <sup>4</sup>	Projected # of contracts for PFF
Belvedere	3	\$185,569	3	\$2,201,765	SPA 1	\$539,790	\$285,000	1
Santa Fe Springs	3	\$196,885	3	\$1,616,741	SPA 2	\$842,909	\$520,000	1
Compton	2	\$169,728	3	\$2,288,221	SPA 3	\$978,198	\$530,000	1
Wateridge	3	\$234,225	5	\$2,746,442	SPA 4	\$352,635	\$180,000	1
Vermont Corridor	3	\$164,070	3	\$2,049,025	SPA 5	\$341,120	\$195,000	1
West Los Angeles	1	\$91,370	1	\$625,370	SPA 6	\$1,407,678	\$410,000	1
Pomona	1	\$82,035	2	\$945,260	SPA 7	\$672,669	\$390,000	1
El Monte	1	\$58,273	1	\$685,890	SPA 8	\$701,109	\$474,000	1
Pasadena	3	\$202,542	2	\$1,688,788	AI	\$341,120		1
Glendora	2	\$146,815	3	\$1,538,930	API	\$341,120		1
Lancaster	2	\$111,738	2	\$1,366,016				
Palmdale	1	\$98,159	2	\$1,415,008	Deaf and Hard of Hearing <sup>2</sup>	\$100,000		
Santa Clarita	2	\$144,835	2	\$1,224,804				
West San Fernando Valley	2	\$123,619	1	\$939,496				
San Fernando Valley	3	\$187,832	2	\$1,740,662				
Metro North	3	\$200,279	3	\$1,726,253				
South County	4	\$254,875	3	\$2,342,977				
Torrance	2	\$175,951	2	\$1,677,261				
American Indian (AI)	1	\$8,586	1	\$394,591				
Asian Pacific Islander (API)	1	\$24,613	1	\$493,239				
<b>Total Number of Contracts</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$2,861,999</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>\$29,706,739</b>		<b>\$6,618,348</b>	<b>\$2,984,000</b>	<b>10</b>

1. The number of contracts to be awarded are projections and subject to change. Funding will be apportioned based upon an evaluation of the agency's capacity and other similar objective measures as reflected in the winning proposals for each catchment area.
2. This is not a contract but rather funding available to all CAPIT and Prevention & Aftercare contractors to better serve the Deaf and Hard of Hearing communities.
3. Prevention & Aftercare Services is projecting one contract per service area listed.
4. Adoption Promotion and Support Services is projecting one contract per service area listed.